

that was too late. Many had already printed the piece, and had to wait for the next day to carry the AP's follow-up explanation.

The Morning News's blunder was easily identified. "We require two independent sources [on major stories]," Langer explained, "and an editor has to know who the sources are." So far, so good. While the Tuesday story quoted only one source, a "Washington lawyer familiar with the negotiations," the paper actually had another that it did not reveal, and even a third on a "tell me if I shouldn't print this" basis, according to Langer. When the primary source backed out, Langer checked the second source. He found that source had thought he was confirming the vaguer story the Morning News had carried on Monday, not the more specific Tuesday version.

As all this unfolded, the Monday editions of the New York Post and the New York Daily News splashed identical frontpage headlines, Caught in the Act. Each quoted only "sources," without further elaboration. The Washington Post and the Los Angeles Times ran similar reports from their own sources. The Wall Street Journal did the same. Of course, there is no way short of a public unmasking to tell if all these publications' sources were separate individuals or the same (busy) people talking to all of them. Meanwhile, on television newscasts, the story lost its qualifications, drifting toward a concreteness that still had not been justified.

The Morning News, strangely enough, later insisted that its original story was mainly correct, and that the mistakes involved only "nuances." "We thought we had two sources saying a Secret Service agent was negotiating for access to Starr, had gotten it and had talked to Starr's camp," Langer says. "Our source bailed out because it was a 'former or present agent'—a nuance, and, second, the negotiations to get this person to Starr were complex, and mediators were involved. The basic facts of a Secret Service agent, past or present, being put in touch with Starr was correct." But Langer also downgraded the "compromising situation" of Clinton and Lewinsky to an "ambiguous" one—a much more important shift.

Darrell Christian, AP managing editor, says the changes, especially the less damning description of the position Lewinsky and Clinton were caught in involved more than nuances. "When they [the Dallas Paper] withdrew the story and said those details were inaccurate, we thought we had no choice but to take it off the wire."

As CJR went to press, no news organization had been able to confirm any part of the story beyond doubt. No present or former agent had been named. No journalist had claimed direct contact with him or her.

So, Langer was asked, is the story true? "Tough questions. I can't personally answer. People in a position to know are saying it is true, and I don't think they're making it up."

#### A BREAKDOWN IN FARM COUNTRY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, when farmers break down in the field during harvest, they do not have the luxury of hauling their equipment to the shop to wait on time-consuming repairs. Instead, they use the tools they have available at the time, a pliers, a hammer, baling wire, to get the equipment moving again and to get the crop in the bin.

Mr. Speaker, it is harvest time in Kansas, and our markets are having a breakdown. Farmers in Kansas and across America are facing tough times. The wheat harvest is well underway, and while the yields have been satisfactory, farmers are facing the lowest prices in recent memory, due in large part to lagging exports of U.S. commodities.

Projections by the U.S. Department of Agriculture forecast agricultural exports declining \$5 billion this year. This decline is having a serious impact on the bottom line for Kansas farm families. Current wheat prices are \$1 lower than those received during the last 2 years.

One of our best chances to lift commodity prices and breathe life into the farm economy is through an aggressive export policy. The House of Representatives today made a significant move in that direction. Today we passed the agricultural appropriation bill for 1999. Under this legislation, the P.L. 480 Food for Peace Program is fully funded at over \$1 billion.

The Export Enhancement Program is fully funded at \$550 million to help combat unfair export subsidies, and the General Sales Manager Program is funded at a level that makes available over \$5 billion of credit guarantees for agricultural exports.

U.S. farmers are clearly the most efficient and can compete with farmers anywhere in the world. They cannot, however, compete with the treasuries of the European Union and other subsidizing countries. U.S. farmers continue to lose markets and market share due to foreign subsidies and unfair trading practices by our competitors. Still, the Clinton administration has refused to use the tools we have available to combat these subsidies and gain negotiating strength to push for that level playing field in future trade negotiations.

Today's action by Congress makes it clear, we are committed to an aggressive trade policy, committed to exports, and committed to American agriculture. Despite the current crisis, the administration has been reluctant to use the Export Enhancement Program for wheat or flour, citing criticism of the program, without offering alternatives or suggestions to make the program more effective.

The fact is that EEP is one of the few export promotion programs that is authorized, funded, and GATT legal. If changes need to be made to the program to make it more effective, these steps can and should be taken by the administration.

With the passage today of the agricultural appropriation bill, Congress, both the House and Senate, have acted to give USDA both the authority as well as the money to aggressively combat trade subsidies by our agriculture competitors.

Mr. Speaker, there is a breakdown in farm country, and it is time for this administration to use the tools, be that

the pliers or the hammer or the baling wire, whatever it takes. Those tools are available. They need to be used, and we need to get our farmers up and running.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Guam (Mr. UNDERWOOD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. UNDERWOOD addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GUTKNECHT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### FOREIGN OPERATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1999

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives will soon be addressing the foreign operations appropriations bill for fiscal year 1999. Shortly after the July 4 recess members of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs will begin marking up this legislation, which determines to a major degree American engagement in a changing world.

I would like to take this opportunity to address an area where I believe American policies, assistance, and investment can make a critical difference in promoting our values of democracy, human rights, and free markets. That is, support for the Republics of Armenia and Nagorno Karabagh.

Mr. Speaker, I served as co-chairman with the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER) of the Congressional Caucus on Armenian Issues. Our Caucus has 64 members from both sides of the aisle, and I visited Armenia and Nagorno Karabagh, and can tell Members that the need for help is still great, and the potential of Armenia to be a long-term friend and partner of the United States is also great.

The Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related deserves praise for many important provisions in the fiscal year 1998 foreign ops bill. That legislation provided for the first time direct U.S. humanitarian assistance to the people of Nagorno Karabagh. It also established a discretionary spending fund to restore infrastructure and promote regional integration in the Caucasus.

As in previous years, the legislation also earmarked direct aid to the Republic of Armenia. It maintained the section 907 ban on direct aid to Azerbaijan, albeit with some very big exemptions, until that country lifts its blockade of Armenia and Nagorno